

REMARKS

Claims 1, 29, 55, and 57-61 are amended. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 33, 34, 40 and 41 are canceled. After entry of these amendments, claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-32, 35-39, and 42-61 will be pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because the term “and/or” did not allow the Examiner to determine the metes and bounds of the invention as claimed. Applicants’ amendment to claim 1 removes the term “and/or”. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-25, 27-29, 31-37, 39, 42-51, 53-55, 57 and 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No. US 2003/0172126 (Brown et al.) in view of Pat. No. 6,983,273 (Banerjee et al.). The Examiner rejected claims 2, 30, 56 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Brown and Banerjee as applied to claims 1, 29, 55 and 57 in view of Pub. No. US 2005/0044224 to Jun et al. The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Brown and Banerjee as applied to claims 1 and 29 in view of Pub. No. US 2002/0002438 to Ohmura et al. The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of

Brown and Banerjee as applied to claims 1 and 29 in view of Pub. No. US 2002/0059073 to Zondervan et al.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method comprising:

receiving an interest signal indicating an interest in a hyperlink contained in a first document;

generating a request for online third-party-provided information about a second document associated with the hyperlink, wherein the third-party-provided information ***comprises a content snippet of the second document and is provided by a source other than a publisher or author of the second document;***

receiving the third-party-provided information; and

causing the third-party-provided information to be output in association with the first document.

Applicants amended claim 1 to incorporate limitations similar to those found in claim 5. Thus, claim 1 now describes receiving an interest signal indicating interest in a hyperlink contained in a first document. A request for online third-party-provided information about a second document associated with the hyperlink is generated, the third-party-provided information comprising a content snippet of the second document and provided by a source other than a publisher or author of the second document. The third-party-provided information is received and output in association with the first document. Claims 29, 55 and 57 have several limitations in common with claim 1. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in paragraph 50 of the specification.

Brown and Banerjee, alone or in combination, fail to disclose these limitations. Brown discusses a way to display condensed web page information in response to a user query. (Brown, Abstract) However, Brown's "condensed web page information" (e.g.

meta-tag information) is obtained from the “web page host”; that is, from the publisher of that page (Brown, Abstract, Figs. 2, 3) and is not a content snippet of the second document.

The second reference, Banerjee, discusses a way to associate search results with predefined symbols indicative of the characteristics of the linked sites (Banerjee, Abstract). However, Banerjee also fails to mention outputting a content snippet of a second document from a source other than a publisher or author of the second document. At best, Banerjee provides for displaying a limited universe of predefined symbols, not outputting a content snippet of a given document from a source other than the author or publisher of the second document. (Banerjee, Abstract)

Thus, neither Brown nor Banerjee disclose “generating a request for online third-party-provided information about a second document associated with the hyperlink, wherein the third-party-provided information wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document and is provided by a source other than a publisher or author of the second document.” In addition, none of the other references (Jun, Ohmura or Zondervan), alone or in combination, discusses third-party-provided information comprising a content snippet of a second document that is provided by a source other than a publisher or author of the second document.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 29, 55, and 57 are allowable over the cited references for the reasons described above. Claims 2-4, 7-11, 14-28, and 59-61 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Claims 30-32, 35-39, and 42-54 depend directly or indirectly from claim 29. Claim 56 depends directly or indirectly from claim 55. Claim 58 depends directly or indirectly from claim 57. In addition to containing

all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend, respectively, these claims also contain additional limitations that are not shown by the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
GREGORY JOSEPH BADROS, ET AL.

Date: August 3, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com